

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Michigan



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at Carlas.Mccauley@ed.gov.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Michigan Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O.Box 30008 Lansing MI 48909
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Linda Forward Position and Office: Director, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation Contact's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909 Telephone: (517) 241-3232 Fax: (517) 241-2540 Email address: Forwardl@michigan.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Michael P. Flanagan	Telephone: (517) 373-3823
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request.

Michigan Department of Education is requesting the priority schools list waiver.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Michigan is providing a list of Priority schools from 2012 and 2013 for eligibility for FY 2013 new awards. (See Attachment A)

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below. An example of the table has been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

EXAMPLE:

¹ "Newly Eligible" refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State's assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a "persistently lowest-achieving school" or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about "newly eligible schools," please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds. Michigan did not run a competition for SIG Schools for SY 2013 – 2014. Michigan has not yet run a competition for SIG schools for SY 14 -15, and therefore did not terminate any awards.

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA's application for a School Improvement Grant.

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

A copy of the LEA district and building application is provided as Attachment B. The application includes a scoring rubric that will be used to evaluate the information provided in the LEA application. In addition, Michigan Department of Education staff will conduct face-to-face or conference call interviews with the SIG teams of each school that is selected to receive a School Improvement Grant prior to the grant being awarded.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

All newly identified districts and schools in Michigan are required to complete a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). Continuing schools are required to complete Data Dialogues. The CNA/Data Dialogue analyzes the student achievement data as well as system processes and protocols of practice that are in place to support student achievement. Information from the CNA/Data Dialogue is used to set specific, measurable goals for each school. This forms the basis of an improvement plan that is monitored and revised as needed.

Examples of the items that will be evaluated are:

- Analysis of student achievement data
- Analysis of teacher, principal data
- Assessment of system processes
- Use of analysis to select turnaround model
- Inclusion of external partner for turnaround model

- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

The SEA will require the LEA to demonstrate that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school. The SEA will look for evidence of adequate resources and related support for each priority school as applicable in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model. The scoring rubric will look for the following:

- Level of funding appropriate for described activities
- Selection of a district level coordinator responsible for oversight and monitoring of the model
- Selection of an external partner to provide support
- Evidence of commitment of teachers and leaders to the turnaround effort
- Evidence of school board support for the turnaround effort
- Evidence of community inclusion and support for the turnaround effort
- Evidence of what the LEA proposes to do differently to produce student achievement
- Evidence of LEA financial stability and fiscal responsibility

- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Budgets received from the LEAs will be reviewed to ensure that they have adequately budgeted for the activities to support the intervention model selected. Each identified priority school may receive up to \$2,000,000 per year for up to 3 years not to exceed a total of \$6,000,000 to improve the levels of student achievement and graduation rates through the use of one of the turnaround models. The SEA rubric will evaluate the budget for the following:

- Budget items are reasonable, necessary, and allowable for Title I funding
- Budget includes personnel and activities necessary to implement the selected model
- Budget covers allowable timelines
- Budget items are tied to specifics in the approved plan

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEAs commitment to do the following:

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

Michigan will review LEA grant applications for evidence that all required elements are

addressed for the reform model selected for/by the priority school. Schools selected to receive the School Improvement Grant will be assigned a monitor who will assess grant implementation on a regular basis. The Michigan Department of Education will also review the application to find evidence that the district is assigning a staff person to oversee and monitor implementation in its priority schools that receive School Improvement Grant funds.

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;

Michigan will screen external providers and compile a list of preferred providers to LEAs. If an LEA does not select from the State list, the provider selected by the LEA must also go through the state approval process prior to engaging in the turnaround intervention. See Attachment B for the external provider application and rubric

- Align other resources with the interventions;

Michigan will review LEA applications for evidence of the coordinated use of funds to implement the intervention selected by the LEA. The LEA application budget section details resources suggested for possible coordination and implementation and for budget details.

- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,

Michigan will review LEA applications for evidence of change in practice and policy. Examples may include:

- Teacher commitment to implement the selected intervention
- Granting operational flexibility to the principal
- Removing other initiatives from the building so that staff can focus on the intervention
- Releasing staff from professional development not related to the focus of the intervention
- Appointing a district level person to oversee the intervention selected
- Evidence of school board support for the intervention
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The Michigan Department of Education will review LEA applications for evidence that the LEA will begin working from the start of the grant toward sustainability at the end of the three-year grant period. Examples may include:

- A clear plan to coordinate the use of federal, state and local funds to implement the intervention
- Budget detail that shows a decreasing need for SIG funding over the life of the grant
- A plan for how external supports will be decreased over time and school personnel will take on the leadership of the intervention
- A plan for continuing accountability measures after the life of the School Improvement Grant

- **B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:** In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

Prior to the release of SIG funds, the SEA will review all proposed first-year budgeted activities from pre-implementation through implementation to assure that pre-implementation activities are allowable and directly related to the implementation of the intervention model identified by the LEA as meeting its needs to improve student achievement. Reviewers will also evaluate whether adequate funds remain after pre-implementation activities to fund the activities planned during the first year of the grant. Pre-implementation activities are not required.

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

The SEA will first review the proposed pre-implementation activities to determine whether they are reasonable, necessary and directly related to the first-year implementation plan of the intervention model selected. IF the activities pass this screening, reviewers will then look to the SIG Guidance to determine whether the proposed activities fall into allowable areas. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Family and community engagement that is designed to engage the broader school "family" in the implementation of the reform plan
- Recruiting and interviewing external providers who bring expertise to the implementation of the reform plan
- Recruiting and interviewing staff
- Providing remediation or supplemental instruction for students prior to the start of the school year
- Piloting teacher and principal evaluation systems
- Any other activities that will lead to the full implementation of the reform plan at the start of the 2014 -15 school year

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

- LEA application will be released within 30 days of approval of this application by the United States Department of Education
- LEA applications will be due to the MDE within 60 days after release
- The MDE will issue preliminary awards to districts, unless negotiation is needed, within 90 days after receipt from LEA.

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority schools, as applicable, and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools, or one or more priority schools, in at LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

To achieve the desired outcome of rapid improvement in student achievement, LEAs and their school must set rigorous, achievable goals and strive to meet them. The MDE will require all LEAs and their schools that receive School Improvement Grant funds to do the following:

- Submit the required baseline data on student achievement and other indicators from the year preceding the grant award
- Set rigorous, achievable academic performance goals for each year of the grant
- Specify the interim assessments they will use to provide regular achievement progress reports
- High schools receiving School Improvement Grant funds will be required to administer the Explore and Plan assessments to provide a measure of annual growth at the high school level (Michigan uses the ACT as part of its annual State assessment for high school students)

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Michigan has requested the priority schools list waiver and will have no Tier III schools.

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

Monitors assigned by the SEA will gather data on a quarterly basis through on-site visits to determine whether and how well the requirements in the reform plan are being implemented, whether expenditures are being made on a timely and appropriate basis, and whether progress is being made on student achievement. The SEA will also assess the level of implementation of the School Improvement Grant based on leading/lagging indicators, State assessments, and monitoring reports.

(4) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

In the event the SEA does not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies, priority will be given to schools in LEAs that demonstrate the strongest plans and commitment to implement fully and efficiently one of the four required reform models. Priority will be given to schools that have not previously received School Improvement Grant Funds. Based on State authority, not federal guidelines, priority will also be given to schools that have selected the Transformation model or Turnaround model rather than the Restart model or the Closure model. Weight may also be given to the school's poverty rate and level of proficiency in mathematics and reading, writing, social studies and science.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Michigan Department of Education has requested the priority schools list waiver and will have no Tier III schools.

(6) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, or any priority schools, as applicable, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

Michigan has State legislation (Public Act 201 of 2009) that allows the State Superintendent to appoint a State School Reform/Redesign Officer (SSRO) who oversees and monitors the progress of the lowest performing schools. Michigan's priority schools (lowest 5%) must choose one of the four reform models as specified in the Federal School Improvement Grant Guidance, file a reform plan, and implement the reform plan. If a school does not make progress, the SSRO may recommend that the school be placed in the State Redesign District and take control of the school. If the SSRO places schools into the State Redesign District and takes direct control, the SEA will submit to the United States Department of Education a list of identified priority schools it will take over and the reform model to be implemented in each school.

(7) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, or for priority schools, as applicable, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

The SEA does not intend to provide direct services to any schools in the absence of a takeover. The SEA does intend to provide support to schools in the context of evaluating progress on meeting goals for student achievement. The SEA has posted on its website, a list of external service providers that are available to assist schools in implementing their selected reform model.

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- ☒ Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

- ☒ If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

Administration

Infrastructure

Michigan has employed and trained staff and consultants to carry out the State led activities of the School Improvement Grant. Staff time is allocated to developing and enhancing the implementation of the School Improvement Grant on an ongoing basis. Staff works with LEA's and schools who are experiencing complex issues that arise. Staff time is also allocated for federal reporting requirements, fiscal and program audits of the School Improvement Grant LEA's and schools, integration within the MDE across other program areas, and funding streams including traditional Title I and II funds, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), and other Statewide initiatives such as the teacher evaluation project.

On-Line Grant Process

To facilitate the competitive grant application process, Michigan will provide technical assistance to eligible districts in the form of a webinar and/or face-to-face group meeting. The technical assistance will provide background information and expectations of the School Improvement Grant as well as information about choosing vendors, allowable grant expenditures, and preparation of a budget.

Applications will be submitted via the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS+). The system includes an on-line application and end-of-year reporting mechanism. Utilizing the system enables the MDE to receive the grant application and budget on-line. At the close of each grant year, the system allows for the renewal expenditure reporting through the State's grants closure systems.

Data Collection and Reporting

Michigan will use the Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI) to track and report the leading/lagging indicators to the United States Department of Education. The system collects data on students, school personnel, and financial records. These data will be enhanced to include data specific to the School Improvement Grant.

Technical Assistance

Monitors

Michigan will identify monitors for each school. Experienced educators may be contracted as monitors. In the early months of grant implementation, monitors will visit the schools once weekly. If implementation problems and/or barriers surface, monitors will visit schools on a more frequent basis to be certain that grant implementation is on track. After the early months of the grant, monitors' school visits may be reduced to once per month.

Partnership Network

Michigan will facilitate a partnership network with districts and schools that has a two-fold purpose. One, the meetings serve as a two-way communication vehicle between the MDE and the districts/schools and two, an opportunity for districts/schools to share best practice and learnings with each other. It is anticipated that 4 – 6 meetings will be held yearly. Plans are also underway to establish a vehicle for establishing an on-line learning community for SIG grantees.

State and National Networking

SEA staff and consultants will participate in meetings and conferences with other states to gather information about promising practices and benchmarks and bring the information back to Michigan.

Evaluation

SEA staff and consultants will provide requested information to the United States Department of Education for the federal evaluation. In addition, Michigan has funded an evaluation of the SIG Cohort I and Cohort II schools (WestEd). As funds allow, case studies of SIG schools and districts will be conducted.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

☒ By checking this box, the SEA assures that it has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

Michigan requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s

assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools") that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its "minimum n." The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its "minimum n" in its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools." In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

☒ In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of "priority schools" in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

☒ The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State's lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

☒ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

Additional Waiver Requests:

Michigan is requesting a waiver to extend the period of availability of the fiscal year (FY) 2012 School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds awarded under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended, until September 30, 2017. Michigan is also requesting to amend the use of (FY) 2012 funds for the three-year implementation of a new Cohort. These requests, submitted pursuant to section 9401(d)(2) of the ESEA, would permit the Michigan Department of Education to make new awards, using FY 2012 SIG funds in combination with FY 2013 funds for a new cohort of schools (Cohort III) that will begin their three-year SIG implementation in the 2014 – 2015 school year.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Michigan requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

☐ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

☐ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or

restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☐ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the schoolwide poverty threshold through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

☐ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☐ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

I. ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS

☒ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each priority school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each priority school, as applicable.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY	INTERVENTION			
			turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority school, identified in the LEA's application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its priority schools, as applicable.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each priority school, it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each priority school, it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's priority schools; and

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each priority school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and

mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds.

- (3) If it implements a restart model in a priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.